

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

25X	FROM: [REDACTED] Acting Chief, Policy & Plans Group 4E-70, Hdqs.	EXTENSION [REDACTED]	NO.		
			DATE RECEIVED FORWARDED	DATE [REDACTED]	
25X1	TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	OFFICER'S INITIALS		COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)	
		1. DD/PTOS [REDACTED]		10 MAR 80	Attached is latest edition of draft APEX Manual. Please review and provide any comments to PPG not later than 10 March 1980.
		2. DD/PSI 4E-58, Hdqs.		11 MAR 80	C
		3. C/SSC [REDACTED]		12 MAR 80	Bob M. Novice SSC will be commanding directly to APEX steering group.
		4. C/SEG 4E-21, Hdqs.		10 MAR 1978	C
		5.			
		6.			
		7.			
		8.			
		9.			
		10.			
		11.			
		12.			
		13.			
		14.			
15.					

25X

BASIC

Date

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals,
clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

★ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979—281-184/1

[redacted] subbed
the attached. The
package is not complete
in that Charlie has not
had a chance to [redacted] prepare
his own comments. He will
do so ASAP.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

APEX Industrial Security Manual Draft-28 Feb 80

FROM: 25X1 		EXTENSION 	NO. 25X
C/PSD/PTOS			DATE 11 March 1980
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED	
1. DD/PTOS	11 MAR 1980		<i>P</i>
2. <i>PLC's 14 MAR 80</i>			
3. <i>CCW</i>			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

Attached are the PSD comments on the latest edition of the draft APEX industrial manual. This was originally dead-lined for yesterday, but as you know we got an extension from PPG until cob today.

In general, the comments are minor. One question I would suggest is the overall classification of the manual, which we feel should be unclassified. Except for the two question-marked paragraphs, all others are marked "unclassified." We see no reason to classify the manual at all.

APEX INDUSTRIAL SECURITY MANUAL DRAFT

28 February 1980

PHYSICAL SECURITY DIVISION COMMENTS

The following comments are keyed by page and paragraph number to the 28 February 1980 DRAFT text:

Page 1, Paragraph 5

Concern was expressed as to how the government would assure that the implementing guidance is uniform from one official or agency to another. It was felt that any such guidance should be reviewed by the APEX Steering Group before it is published for implementation.

Page 2, Paragraph 8

This paragraph requires annual inspections of Contractor APEX Control Facilities. Manpower limitations may make this an unrealistic expectation.

Page 3, Paragraph 12

The annual revalidation of access approvals required by this paragraph is a good idea, but will require extensive contractor input, the cost of which will be passed on by the contractor to the government.

Page 5, Paragraph 17 E

The two-year reindoctrination interval mentioned here is at variance with current Agency guidelines, which specify annual rebriefings. We believe that annual rebriefing of our industrial contractors is a valid and desirable concept.

Page 6, Paragraph 18

It would appear from the content of this paragraph that need-to-know approval rests solely with the responsible Senior Intelligence Officer. Based on our experience, Program Managers and Office Directors are in a better position to know who really needs to know. We would suggest that the need-to-know authority be delegated to that level.

*Content to be seen which says person - 1 yr to exceed 2 yrs
REINFORCE CAN TAKE PLACE PERIODICALLY
NOT TO EXCEED 2 yrs
LOOKS OK
FIRE NOV 1985*

*X IT IS
DELEGATED
BY THE SIO
IN ACCORDANCE
WITH THE
REGULATIONS*

Page 11, Paragraph 39

The use of the work "generally" in line nine of this paragraph could lead one to speculate about the exceptions. If there are exceptions, we again have a situation where it would be difficult to tell just who would know how much about any given activity.

Page 12, Paragraph 43

We would suggest use here of wording similar to that seen on page 14, paragraph 48, which would permit re-inspections to be scheduled at the discretion of the Senior Intelligence Officer. Such an approach would seem more in line with manpower and budgetary limitations. [As a separate issue related to this paragraph (paragraph 43) we would propose that the currently enforced document inventory percentages be the ones used "... to ensure that accountability and control are being maintained."]

*✓
X LANGUAGE IN
MANUAL PROVIDED
ADDITIONAL MITIGATION
NO NECESSITY FOR
NO OPS CEN*

Page 17, Paragraph 59D

If interior pages of APEX documents bear no control number, how are they to be controlled if they should ever become separated from the basic document? How, for example, would lost portions of documents, once found, be traced back to the original? How would a contractor employee, displaying a document on a cathode ray tube (CRT) in order to make a hard copy of it, know what number to use to apply a control to the new document? Would he or she have to page all the way back to the first page to find the control, copy, and series numbers? What real control does the APEX Control System have if most of the materials in it are to bear no control numbers?

Page 19, Paragraph 63

We would suggest that the word "should" in line eight be replaced with the word "will."

Page 21, Paragraph 77

The question mark at the end of this paragraph caused us concern. Was it used because there is some question about the classification of the content of the paragraph? It would appear that the paragraph's content is UNCLASSIFIED.

Page 23, Paragraph 87

The same comment applies as that immediately preceding.

Page 25, Paragraph 95

An APEX Security Officer (ASO) works for the government. A contractor APEX Security Officer (CASO) works for the contractor. In order to be consistent with current procedures, and to result in cost savings to the government, we would suggest that both the ASO and the CASO, as appropriate, be authorized to indoctrinate approved personnel concerning the APEX Special Access Control System.